Imperial/TP/91-92/7
QMW/PH/92/7
April 1992

arXiv:hep-th/9204022v1 9 Apr 1992

Ashtekar Formulation of 2+1 Gravity on a Torus

Nenad Manojlović
The Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College,
Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BZ, U. K.

and

Aleksandar Miković
Department of Physics, Queen Mary and Westfield College,
Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, U. K.

Abstract

Pure (2+1)-dimensional Einstein gravity is analysed in the Ashtekar formulation, when the spatial manifold is a torus. We have found a set of globally defined observables, forming a closed algebra. This allowed us to solve the quantum constraints, and to show that the reduced phase space of the Ashtekar formulation is greater then the corresponding space of the Witten formulation. Furthermore, we have found a globally defined time variable which satisfies all the requiriments of an extrinsic time variable in quantum gravity.

1. Introduction

$(2+1)$-dimensional Einstein gravity [1] is an example of a toy model useful for studying some of the conceptual problems of $(3+1)$-dimensional quantum gravity. The (2+1)-dimensional theory is a tractable model, since it has finitely many physical degrees of freedom, while on the other hand it retains some basic features of the full theory.

The Ashtekar formulation of $3+1$ Einstein gravity has brought significant simplifications of the constraints [2], and a large class of solutions of all the quantum constraints has been found [3]. However, since the basic object in the theory is a connection, it is not clear how to interpret the results in terms of more familiar objects like metrics. Therefore a study of $2+1$ gravity in the Ashtekar formulation may give some insights into these problems.

The connection formulation of $2+1$ gravity was first analysed by Witten [4], who also showed that the theory can be written as a Chern-Simons gauge theory, based on the three-dimensional Poincare group $ISO(1,2)$. The Witten formulation was inspired by the Ashtekar formulation of $3+1$ gravity, but it was Bengtsson who showed that the theory can be formulated in terms of the (2+1)-dimensional analogs of the Ashtekar constraints [5]. He also showed that the two formulations are equivalent for the non-degenerate spatial metrics, and he argued that Witten's formulation is more restrictive than the Ashtekar formulation in the case of the degenerate metrics. Although the reduced phase space and quantization of the Witten theory was studied by many authors [4,6,7,8], this cannot be said for the Ashtekar theory.

In this paper we study the reduced phase space and quantization of the Ashtekar formulation of 2+1 gravity in the case when the spatial manifold is a torus. The advantage of the torus case is that one can explicitely write down the global variables which can be used to define the global physical degrees of freedom. Our choice of the global variables is motivated by the variables used in the Ashtekar formulation of Bianchi cosmologies in $3+1$ dimensions [9]. Consequently, the theory becomes equivalent to a pair of particles propagating in a three-dimensional Minkovski space, subjected to constraints. By constructing an algebra of observables we solve the quantum theory and find the reduced phase space (RPS), and consequently show that the RPS of the

Ashtekar theory is larger than the RPS of the Witten theory. Furthermore, we construct a time variable out of the elements of the algebra of observables, and write down the corresponding Schrodinger equation, which is equivalent to a $(2+1)$-dimensional massless Klein-Gordon equation.

In section 2 we discuss the canonical formalism for the Palatini form of the Einstein-Hilbert action. We derive the Ashtekar form of the constraints from the Palatini action by a judicious choice of the normal vector of the foliation. In section 3 we specialize to the case when the spatial manifold is a torus, and introduce global variables by using the cohomology basis forms. We then derive the corresponding effective finite-dimensional theories describing the Witten and the Ashtekar formulations, and then rederive the reduced configuration space for the Witten theory. In section 4 we study the Ashtekar constraints in terms of our variables. We use the Dirac method to solve the gauge constraint, and from the form of the solution we deduce the gauge invariant coordinates. Then we solve the scalar constraint by constructing an algebra of observables, which turns out to be isomorphic to the three-dimensional Poincare algebra. The scalar constraint then becomes the masslessness condition. This gives only two inequivalent irreducible representations, a scalar and a spinor, which correspond to two inequivalent quantizations of the theory. The corresponding massless Klein-Gordon equation can be then used to define a time variable. In section five we present our conclussions.

2. Canonical Formalisam

We start from the Palatini action

$$S(e,\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x\, \epsilon^{\lambda\mu\nu} e_{\lambda a} F^a_{\mu\nu} \ , \tag{2.1}$$

where $\lambda, \mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2$ are the coordinate indices on a three dimensional space-time manifold $\mathcal{M}$, while $a, b, c = (0), (1), (2)$ are the Lie algebra $L(SO(2,1))$ indices. η is the Minkowski metric on $L(SO(2,1))$ and $\epsilon^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ is the metric independent totally anti-symmetric tensor density of weight one, with $\epsilon_{012} = 1$. $e_\lambda{}^a$ is a triad, a one-form on $\mathcal{M}$ which takes its values in the Lie algebra $L(SO(2,1))$. $F^a_{\mu\nu}$ is the curvature for a spin connection $\omega_\mu{}^a$ on $\mathcal{M}$. In order to obtain the canonical formulation of the theory we have to assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is topologicaly equivalent to $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$, where Σ

is a two-dimensional manifold. We take Σ to be a compact manifold. Let X be a diffeomorphism $X : \Sigma \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{M}$, such that it defines a foliation. We then choose a Lorentzian metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ such that each leaf $\Sigma_t \equiv X_t(\Sigma)$ is a space-like submanifold of $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Next we introduce the deformation vector of the foliation $t^\mu \equiv \dot{X}^\mu$, and decompose it into two components, one of which lies along the surface Σ_t and the other is normal to Σ_t

$$t^\mu \equiv \dot{X}^\mu = N g^{\mu\nu} n_\nu + N^i \partial_i X^\mu \ . \tag{2.2}$$

$i = 1, 2$ is the coordinate index on Σ, N is the lapse function, N^i is the shift vector and n_t is the normal to the foliation, defined to be the unique one-form n_t on $\mathcal{M}$ which satisfies the equations

$$n_\mu \partial_i X^\mu = 0 \ , \tag{2.3a}$$

$$g^{\mu\nu} n_\mu n_\nu = -1 \ . \tag{2.3b}$$

Equation (2.3a) means that $n_t(x)$ is normal to the hypersurface Σ_t, while the equation (2.3b) is the normalization condition for n_t. The induced metric on Σ is given by

$$g_{ij} = \partial_i X^\mu \partial_j X^\nu g_{\mu\nu} \tag{2.4}$$

and the spatial components of ω and e are defined as

$$A_i{}^a = \partial_i X^\mu \omega_\mu{}^a \quad , \quad e_{ia} = \partial_i X^\mu e_{\mu a} \quad . \tag{2.5}$$

The action (2.1) can be now rewritten as

$$S = \int dt \int_\Sigma d^2x \left(E^i{}_a \dot{A}^a_i - N n^\mu \omega^a_\mu G_a - N^i (\frac{1}{2} e^a_i \epsilon^{jk} F^a_{jk} - A^a_i G_a) - N n^\mu e^a_\mu \epsilon^{ij} F^a_{ij} \right), \tag{2.6}$$

where ϵ^{ij} is the Levi-Civita tensor density on Σ, $E^i{}_a = \epsilon^{ij} e_{ja}$ and

$$G_a = \partial_i E^i{}_a + \epsilon_{ab}{}^c A_i{}^b E^i{}_c \tag{2.7}$$

are the generators of the local Lorentz transformations. By taking X^μ to be the trivial foliation $X^0 = t, X^i = x^i$, one recovers from (2.6) the Witten formulation of $2+1$ gravity [4], since then $N^i = 0$ and the constraints are

$$G_a = \partial_i E^i{}_a + \epsilon_{ab}{}^c A_i{}^b E^i{}_c \approx 0 \ , \tag{2.8a}$$

$$C^a = \epsilon^{ij} F^a_{ij} \approx 0 \ . \tag{2.8b}$$

However, one does not have to choose the foliation X^μ explicitely. By choosing the normal n to be

$$n_\mu = -\frac{1}{2}|g|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon^{abc}\epsilon^{jk}e_{\mu a}e_{jb}e_{kc} \ , \tag{2.9}$$

where $|g|$ is the determinant of the spatial metric g_{ij} and $\epsilon_{ab}{}^c$ are the structure constants of the Lie algebra $L(SO(2,1))$, satisfying

$$\epsilon_{ab}{}^c\epsilon_{cd}{}^e = -(\eta_{ad}\delta^e_b - \eta_{bd}\delta^e_a) \ , \tag{2.10}$$

the equations (2.3) will be satisfied identicaly. The action (2.1) then takes the following form

$$S = \int dt \int_\Sigma d^2x \left(E^i{}_a\dot{A}^a_i - N^aG_a - N^iG_i - NG_0 \right) \ , \tag{2.11}$$

where $N^a = Nn^\mu\omega^a_\mu$ and

$$G_a = \partial_i E^i{}_a + \epsilon_{ab}{}^c A_i{}^b E^i{}_c \approx 0 \ , \tag{2.12a}$$

$$G_i = F^a_{ij}E^j{}_a - A_i{}^aG_a \approx 0 \ , \tag{2.12b}$$

$$G_0 = \epsilon_a{}^{bc}F^a_{ij}E^i{}_bE^j{}_c \approx 0 \ . \tag{2.12c}$$

The (E, A) variables together with the constraints (2.12) are the three-dimensional analogs of the Ashtekar formulation of general relativity [5]. An important difference between the $3+1$ and the $2+1$ case is that in the $2+1$ case the (E, A) variables are real. Note that the Ashtekar constraints (2.12) are equivalent to the Witten constraints (2.8) if $|g| \neq 0$, since (2.12b) and (2.12c) imply (2.8b) if $det(E^i_aE^{ja}) \neq 0$ [5]. This can be also seen from the equation (2.9), which is defined for $|g| \neq 0$, since classically any two foliations give equivalent theories. However, in the region of the phase space where $|g| = 0$, these theories are different, as the subsequent analysis will show.

Pure three-dimensional Einstein gravity has no propagating degrees of freedom. In the covariant approach this fact follows from the identity $R^{\mu\nu}{}_{\alpha\beta} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\lambda}G^\lambda{}_\sigma$, where $R^{\mu\nu}{}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the curvature tensor and G^λ_σ is the Einstein tensor, so that the Einstein equations in empty space imply vanishing of the curvature tensor [1]. In the canonical approach, this is a consequence of the constraints (2.8) or (2.12). Namely, there are six constraints per space point and there is the same number of the configuration space

variables. This means that there are no local physical degrees of freedom. However, certain global degrees of freedom survive, which make the theory non-trivial.

3. Classical Theory on a Torus

In order to see how the global physical degrees of freedom arise, it is instructive to study the case when Σ is a torus. Torus is a globally homogenous space, and therefore one can find globally defined one-forms $\chi^\alpha(x), \alpha = 1, 2$ which satisfy the Maurer-Cartan equations

$$d\chi^\alpha = 0 \ . \tag{3.1}$$

The corresponding vector fields $L_\alpha(x), \alpha = 1, 2$, satisfy

$$L^i_\alpha \chi^\beta_i = \delta^\beta_\alpha \quad , \quad [L_\alpha, L_\beta] = 0 \ . \tag{3.2}$$

A gauge connection on the torus can be always written as a linear combination of the χ's, with coordinate independent coeficients, up to a gauge transformation, since there is enough gauge symmetry in the theory. Consequently we can write

$$A_i{}^a(x,t) = \mathcal{A}^a{}_\alpha(t)\, \chi_i{}^\alpha(x) \ , \tag{3.3a}$$

$$E^i{}_a(x,t) = |\chi|\, \mathcal{E}_a{}^\alpha(t) L^i{}_\alpha(x) \ , \tag{3.3b}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^a{}_\alpha = \frac{1}{\Omega} \int_\Sigma d^2x\, |\chi|\, A_i{}^a L^i{}_\alpha \ , \tag{3.4a}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_a{}^\alpha = \frac{1}{\Omega} \int_\Sigma d^2x\, E^i{}_a \chi_i{}^\alpha \ , \tag{3.4b}$$

and $\Omega = \int_\Sigma d^2x|\chi|$. The $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ variables are global and coordinate indipendent, and can be used to define the global physical degrees of freedom. Note that in the case of $(3+1)$ gravity the choice (3.3) is a genuine reduction of the degrees of freedom [10], while in the $2+1$ case (3.3) can be thought of as a partial gauge choice.

By inserting the expressions (3.3) into the action (2.11), we obtain the effective finite-dimensional theory, defined by the action

$$S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left(\Omega\, \mathcal{E}_a{}^\alpha \dot{\mathcal{A}}^a_\alpha - m^a \mathcal{G}_a - n\mathcal{S} \right) \ , \tag{3.5}$$

where the Lagrange multipliers $\{m^a, n\}$ impose the first class constraints

$$\mathcal{G}_a = \epsilon_{ab}{}^c \mathcal{A}^b{}_\alpha \mathcal{E}_c{}^\alpha \ , \tag{3.6a}$$

$$\mathcal{S} = \left(\mathcal{A}^a_\alpha \mathcal{E}^\alpha_a\right)^2 - \mathcal{A}^a_\alpha \mathcal{E}^\alpha_b \mathcal{A}^b_\beta \mathcal{E}^\beta_a \ . \tag{3.6b}$$

The constraint (3.6a) is the global remnant of the gauge constraint G_a, while (3.6b) is the global remnant of the scalar constraint G_0. The global remnant of the diffeomorphism constraint G_i is proportional to $\mathcal{G}$ and therefore not indipendent. The constraints (3.6) are irreducible and first class, and form the following Poisson bracket algebra

$$\{\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b\} = \epsilon_{ab}{}^c \mathcal{G}_c \ , \tag{3.7a}$$

$$\{\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{S}\} = 0 \ , \tag{3.7b}$$

which can be derived by using the basic canonical brackets

$$\{\mathcal{A}^a_\alpha, \mathcal{E}^\beta_b\} = \delta^\beta_\alpha \delta^a_b \quad . \tag{3.8}$$

There are four constraints and six degrees of freedom in the action (3.5), so that leaves only two physical degrees of freedom. One can obtain the same result in the Witten formulation. By inserting the expressions (3.3) into the Witten constraints (2.8), one gets the action

$$S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left(\Omega \, \mathcal{E}_a{}^\alpha \dot{\mathcal{A}}^a_\alpha - m^a \mathcal{G}_a - n_a \mathcal{C}^a \right) \ , \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_a = \epsilon_{ab}{}^c \mathcal{A}^b{}_\alpha \mathcal{E}_c{}^\alpha \approx 0 \ , \tag{3.10a}$$

$$\mathcal{C}^a = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \, \epsilon^a{}_{bc} \mathcal{A}^b{}_\alpha \mathcal{A}^c{}_\beta \approx 0 \ . \tag{3.10b}$$

The constraints (3.10) are first class and their Poissson bracket algebra is

$$\{\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b\} = \epsilon_{ab}{}^c \mathcal{G}_c \ , \tag{3.11a}$$

$$\{\mathcal{C}^a, \mathcal{G}_b\} = \epsilon^a{}_{bc} \mathcal{C}^c \ . \tag{3.11b}$$

However, the constraints (3.10) are not independent, since they satisfy

$$\mathcal{A}^a_\alpha G_a - \mathcal{E}^\alpha_a \mathcal{C}^a = 0 \quad . \tag{3.12}$$

This means that there are $3+3-2=4$ indipendent constraints, which gives $6-4=2$ physical degrees of freedom. This agrees with the result obtained in [8], where the reduced phase space was analysed through the Wilson loop variables (trace of the holonomies), as well as with the dimension of the space of flat gauge-inequivalent connections on the torus.

In order to show that the reduced configuration space defined by the constraints (3.10) is the same as the moduli space of flat connections on a torus, one can use the same method as the one employed in [8], i.e. analyse the holonomy variables

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, U_\gamma(A) = \mathrm{Tr}\, \mathrm{P} \exp \int_\gamma A^a_i \tau_a dx^i \quad , \tag{3.13}$$

where τ_a are matrices representing the $LSO(1,2)$ algebra, and γ is a loop on the torus. By chosing a homology basis of loops $\{\gamma_\alpha\}$ such that

$$\int_{\gamma_\alpha} \chi^\beta = \delta^\beta_\alpha \quad , \tag{3.14}$$

and by using (3.3a), we get

$$T_\alpha \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\, U_\alpha = \mathrm{Tr} \exp(\mathcal{A}^a_\alpha \tau_a) \quad . \tag{3.15}$$

T_α have vanishing Poisson brackets with the constraints (3.10) and therefore represent observables in the Witten formulation. A connection $A = \mathcal{A}^a_\alpha \tau_a \chi^\alpha = \theta_\alpha \chi^\alpha$ is flat if θ_α belongs to an Abelian subalgebra of $LSO(1,2)$. Consequently, there will be three sectors, depending on whether $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_\alpha$ is space-like, time-like or null. In terms of the U_α these sectors correspond to $SO(2), SO(1,1)$ and $GL(1)$ subgroups, respectively. This gives for the reduced configuration space

$$C^*_W = \Big(S^1 \times S^1\Big) \cup \Big(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+\Big) \cup \mathbb{R} \quad . \tag{3.16}$$

In order to obtain the reduced configuration space C^*_A for the theory defined by the Ashtekar constraints (3.6), we will also use the method of finding the algebra of observables.

4. Dirac Analysis

Let us introduce a notation $\vec{\mathcal{A}}_\alpha \equiv \vec{r}_\alpha$ and $\vec{\mathcal{E}}^\alpha \equiv \vec{p}_\alpha$, so that the system defined by the action (3.5) is equivalent to a system of two particles in the three dimensional Minkowski space, with the constraints

$$\vec{\mathcal{G}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} \vec{r}_\alpha \times \vec{p}_\alpha \approx 0 \ , \tag{4.1a}$$

$$\mathcal{S} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{2} \Big(\vec{r}_\alpha \times \vec{r}_\beta\Big) \cdot \Big(\vec{p}_\alpha \times \vec{p}_\beta\Big) = 2\Big(\vec{r}_1 \times \vec{r}_2\Big) \cdot \Big(\vec{p}_1 \times \vec{p}_2\Big) \approx 0 \ . \tag{4.1b}$$

The constraint (4.1a) can be interpreted as the total angular momentum, and it generates the $SO(1,2)$ rotations. The quantum theory can be defined by promoting (r,p) variables into operators satisfying the Heisenberg algebra

$$[x^a_\alpha, p^b_\beta] = i\delta_{\alpha\beta}\eta^{ab} \quad . \tag{4.2}$$

Next we choose the normal ordering for the constraints (4.1) such that

$$\widehat{\vec{\mathcal{G}}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} \widehat{\vec{r}}_\alpha \times \widehat{\vec{p}}_\alpha \ , \tag{4.3a}$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \widehat{x}_1^{[a|}\widehat{x}_2^{|b]}\widehat{p}_{1a}\widehat{p}_{2b} \ . \tag{4.3b}$$

The constraint algebra is preserved under this ordering. As a next step in the Dirac procedure, we impose the constrains (4.3) on the physical states in the coordinate representation. The gauge constraint gives

$$i\widehat{\vec{\mathcal{G}}}\psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} \vec{r}_\alpha \times \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\vec{r}_\alpha} = 0 \ . \tag{4.4}$$

The general solution of the system (4.4) is

$$\psi = \psi(a_1, a_2, a_3) \tag{4.5}$$

where $a_1 = \vec{r}_1 \cdot \vec{r}_1, a_2 = \vec{r}_2 \cdot \vec{r}_2$ and $a_3 = \vec{r}_1 \cdot \vec{r}_2$. The a_i variables can be defined classically, and they represent an irreducible set of rotationally invariant observables. Since a_i form an Abelian algebra, they can be used as coordinates on the reduced phase space obtained by solving the rotational constraint (4.1a). The scalar constraint (4.1b)

is rotationally invariant, and therefore can be expressed as a function of a_i and their canonically conjugate momenta. This implies that the action of the scalar constraint operator on the states (4.5) will be a function of a_i an their derivatives, which can be checked directly

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}}\psi(a_1,a_2,a_3)=\big(a_1a_2-(a_3)^2\big)\,\big(4\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial a_1\partial a_2}-\frac{\partial^2\psi}{(\partial a_3)^2}\big)=0\ . \tag{4.6}$$

It is convenient to perform a coordinate transformation $(a_1,a_2,a_3)\to(\lambda_0,\lambda_1,\lambda_2)$ where

$$\lambda_0=\frac{1}{2}(a_1+a_2)\ , \tag{4.7a}$$

$$\lambda_1=\frac{1}{2}(a_1-a_2)\ , \tag{4.7b}$$

$$\lambda_2=a_3\ . \tag{4.7c}$$

Then (4.6) can be rewritten as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}}\psi(\lambda_0,\lambda_1,\lambda_2)=\big((\lambda_0)^2-(\lambda_1)^2-(\lambda_2)^2\big)\,\big(\partial_0^2\psi-\partial_1^2\psi-\partial_2^2\psi_2\big)=0\ . \tag{4.8}$$

Note that the transformation (4.7) defines a canonical transformation on the reduced phase space $(a,P_a)\to(\lambda,P_\lambda)$ such that $\mathcal{S}=\lambda^2P_\lambda^2$.

In order to find the algebra of observables, note that (4.8) is almost a massless Klein-Gordon equation (KGE). Besides the Poincare symmetry, the massless KGE has a larger group of symmetries, generated by the conformal group. Let us consider the generators $\widehat{\Pi}_i,\widehat{L}_i,\widehat{K}_i,\widehat{\Delta}$ of the conformal algebra, which in our case is the $L(SO(3,2))$ Lie algebra, defined by

$$i\widehat{\Pi}_i\equiv\partial_i\ , \tag{4.9a}$$

$$i\widehat{L}_i\equiv\epsilon_i{}^{jk}\lambda_j\partial_k\ , \tag{4.9b}$$

$$i\widehat{K}_i\equiv-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2\partial_i+\lambda_i\lambda^j\partial_j+d\,\lambda_i\ , \tag{4.9c}$$

$$i\widehat{\Delta}\equiv\lambda^i\partial_i+d\ , \tag{4.9d}$$

where d is a normal ordering constant [11,12]. $\widehat{L}_i$ are the Lorentz generators, $\widehat{K}_i$ are the conformal boosts and $\widehat{\Delta}$ is the dilaton generator. A straightforward calculation shows that $\widehat{L}_i$ and $\widehat{\Delta}$ commute with the scalar constraint $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$

$$[\widehat{\mathcal{S}},\widehat{L}_i]=0\ , \tag{4.10a}$$

$$[\widehat{\mathcal{S}},\widehat{\Delta}]=0\ . \tag{4.10b}$$

The commutator $[\widehat{\mathcal{S}}, K_i]$ is not equal to zero identically

$$[\widehat{\mathcal{S}}, \widehat{K}_i] \approx \frac{2\lambda^2}{i}(d - \frac{1}{2})\partial_i \ , \tag{4.11}$$

where $\approx$ means equality up to terms proportional to $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$. However, if we set $d = \frac{1}{2}$ than the right hand side of (4.10) is weakly equal to zero. Therefore $\widehat{L}_i, \widehat{K}_i$ and $\widehat{\Delta}$ are observables for $2+1$ gravity on a torus, and they form a closed subalgebra of the conformal algebra

$$[\widehat{L}_i, \widehat{L}_j] = i\epsilon_{ij}{}^k \widehat{L}_k \ , \tag{4.12a}$$

$$[\widehat{L}_i, \widehat{K}_j] = i\epsilon_{ij}{}^k \widehat{K}_k \ , \tag{4.12b}$$

$$[\widehat{K}_i, \widehat{K}_j] = 0 \ , \tag{4.12c}$$

$$[\widehat{L}_i, \widehat{\Delta}] = 0 \ , \tag{4.12d}$$

$$[\widehat{K}_i, \widehat{\Delta}] = i\widehat{K}_i \ , \tag{4.12e}$$

which is known as the Weil algebra. Note that K, L and Δ can be defined as classical observables, by dropping the i from the expressions (4.9), and by replacing the ∂_i with P_{λ_i}. The constant d is then zero, while in the quantum case it takes the value $\frac{1}{2}$, in order for the Weil symmetry not to be anomalous.

Note that the scalar constraint can be written as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \widehat{L}^2 - \widehat{\Delta}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \ , \tag{4.13}$$

which means that the elements of the Weil algebra are not independent on the constraint surface. Relation (4.13) implies that a smaller set of observables is more appropriate, which is the Poincare subalgebra $\{K_i, L_i\}$. Furthermore, the following relation is satisfied

$$\widehat{K}^2 = -\frac{1}{4}\lambda^2 \widehat{\mathcal{S}} \quad , \tag{4.14}$$

so that only the massless representations of the Poincare algebra are relevant.

In the quantum theory only the unitary irreducible representations (UIR) are relevant, which for the case of the three-dimensional Poincare group were classified in [13]. Since the relevant UIR are characterized by $K^2 = 0$ and $K_0 > 0$, we set $K_0 = +\sqrt{{K_1}^2 + {K_2}^2}$. There are only two inequivalent massless UIR, the scalar and

the spinor UIR. The wavefunctions belonging the scalar UIR are scalars $\phi(K_1, K_2)$. In this representation $\widehat{K}_i$ are multiplicative operators and $\widehat{L}_i$ act as

$$\widehat{L}_0 = i(K_1\partial_2 - K_2\partial_1) \ , \tag{4.15a}$$

$$\widehat{L}_1 = -iK_0\partial_2 \ , \tag{4.15b}$$

$$\widehat{L}_2 = iK_0\partial_1 \ , \tag{4.15c}$$

where $\partial_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial K_1}$ and similarly for ∂_2. The wavefunctions that belong to the spinor UIR are "almost" scalars in the sense that the infintesimal operators $\widehat{L}_i$ are the same as in (4.15). However, under a finite rotation the wavefunction $\psi(K_1, K_2)$ may change its sign, depending on the value of the rotational parameter [13]. The reason for this pecuilar behaviour of massless spinors in three dimensions can be atributed to the fact that the little group $SO(D-2)$ is not defined in $D = 3$, but instead becomes a finite group $\mathbf{Z}_2$ [14].

Note that the physical state condition $K^2 = 0$ becomes a Klein-Gordon equation in the coordinate representation $K_i = i\frac{\partial}{\partial X^i}$, where X^i are canonically conjugate variables to K_i. Consequently X^0 can be interpreted as a time variable of $2+1$ gravity on a torus. It is not difficult to see that X^0 satisfies all the requirements of an extrinsic time variable, according to Kuchar [15]. One can write a Schrodinger type equation governing the evolution of the wavefunction of the toroidal universe

$$\Big(i\frac{\partial}{\partial T} - \widehat{H}\Big)\Psi(T, X^\alpha) = 0 \quad , \tag{4.16}$$

where $T = X^0$ and $H = K_0 = \sqrt{K_1^2 + K_2^2}$. $\widehat{H}$ is hermitian with respect to the scalar product

$$< \Psi|\Phi >= \int d^2X \, \Psi^*(X, T)\Phi(X, T) \quad , \tag{4.17}$$

which is consequently indipendent of the time T. The states $\Psi(X, T)$ can be expressed as linear combinations of the states $\phi(K_1, K_2)$ as

$$\Psi(X, T) = \int d^2K \, e^{i(K_0T - K_\alpha X^\alpha)}\phi(K_\alpha) \quad . \tag{4.18}$$

Note that in the standard treatment of the KG equation [16], there is an additional factor of $K_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in the integrand of (4.18), which comes from the manifestly Poincare invariant form of (4.18). However, this factor is only important for displaying the

manifest Poincare invariance, and can be removed by rescaling the $\phi(K)$. Then X_α can be represented as $i\frac{\partial}{\partial K_\alpha}$, which is hermitian with respect to the scalar product

$$< \psi|\phi >= \int d^2K\, \psi^*(K)\phi(K) \quad . \tag{4.19}$$

The so called Newton-Wigner operators [16] correspond to representing the X_α as hermitian operators with respect to the scalar product

$$< \psi|\phi >= \int d^2K\, K_0^{-1}\psi^*(K)\phi(K) \quad , \tag{4.20}$$

but according to the Stone-von Neumann theorem any such two representations are unitary equivalent.

5. Conclusions

Our analysis has shown that when Σ is a torus, the reduced phase space of the Ashtekar formulation of $2+1$ gravity is not the same as the RPS of the Witten formulation, something to be expected on general grounds [5], but never demonstrated before. In the Ashtekar theory the reduced configuration space is just $\mathbb{R}^2$, which is bigger but simpler space than (3.15).

This result can be understood from the point of view of the loop variables approach of [8]. Note that in [8] it was the Witten formulation of 2+1 gravity which was analysed. This simplifies the loop variables analysis, since then the trace of the holonomy (3.13) is an observable, while in the Ashtekar formulation (3.13) is not an observable (it transforms under the diffeomorphisms). One can still use the same methods to analyse the theory, but now the similarity with the $3+1$ case is even greater, and one can use exactly the same reasoning as in the $3+1$ case. Namely, in analogy with the $3+1$ case [3], a solution of all the quantum constraints is a wavefunction with a support on the smooth link classes of the spatial manifold. The analogs of the link classes for two-dimensional manifolds are the homotopy classes. The homotopy classes of Σ are directly related to the space of gauge inequivalent flat connections on Σ [8], and therefore it seems that the Ashtekar formulation has the same reduced phase space as the Witten formulation. However, it is known that in the $3+1$ case the wavefunctions with supports on the smooth link classes are not the most general solutions of the quantum constraints (one can have wavefunctions with supports on the generalized

link classes, which include intersecting loops) [17]. This means that more general solutions also exist in the $2+1$ case, which agrees with our result that $C^*_W \subset C^*_A$, so that the wavefunctions with supports on the smooth homotopy classes do not exhaust the whole space of solutions for the Ashtekar constraints.

Note that X^0 represents a time variable in the Ashtekar formulation on a torus. Obtaining the form of X^0 in terms of the loop variables may give a hint about the time variable in the $3+1$ case. Another important point is that we were able to find the usual quantum mechanical interpretation of an abstract scalar product which had been obtained from the UIR of the algebra of observables. However, in order to achieve this, the knowledge of a time variable was essential.

Existence of the spinorial wavefunctions can be interpreted as an inequivalent quantization of the theory, since there are no physical observables which mix the two UIR. Note that Carlip has found a spinorial wavefunction in the Chern-Simmons formulation of the theory on a torus [18]. Since the Chern-Simmons formulation is canonically equivalent to the Witten formulation, and C^*_W is a subset of C^*_A, then it is not surprising that a spinorial wavefunction appears in the Witten theory.

Generalizing our method to the higher genus case does not appear to be straightforward, although a natural candidate for the role of the forms χ is the cohomology basis on Σ, consisting of $2g$ forms, where g is the genus of Σ.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank A. Ashtekar, K. Kuchař and C. Isham for the discussions.

References

[1] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and G. 't Hooft, Annals of Physics 152 (1984) 220

[2] A. Ashtekar, Non-Perturbative Canonical Gravity, World Scientific, Singapore (1991)

[3] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, Nucl. Phys. B 331 (1990) 80

[4] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 311 (1988) 46

[5] I. Bengtsson, Phys. Lett. 220B (1989) 51

[6] J.E. Nelson and T. Regge, Nucl. Phys. B328 (1989) 190

[7] S. Carlip, Nucl. Phys. B324 (1989) 106

[8] A. Ashtekar, V. Husain, C. Rovelli, J. Samuel, L. Smolin, Class. Quant. Grav. 6 (1989) L 185

[9] H. Kodama, Prog. Theor. Phys. 80 (1988) 1024

[10] N. Manojlović and A. Miković, Canonical Analysis of the Bianchi Models in the Ashtekar Formulation, Imperial and QMW preprint, Imperial/TP/90-91/27 and QMW/PH/91/12 (1991)

[11] A. Bracken and B. Jessup J. Math. Phys 23 (1982) 1925

[12] W. Siegel, Introduction to String Field Theory, World Scientific, Singapore (1988)

[13] B. Binegar J. Math. Phys. 23 (1982) 1511

[14] S. Deser and R. Jackiw Phys. Lett. B 263 (1991) 431

[15] K. Kuchar, in Quantum Gravity 2: A Second Oxford Symposium, eds. C.J. Isham, R. Penrose and D.W. Sciama, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1981)

[16] S.S. Schweber, An Introduction to Relativistic Field Theory, Peterson and Row, Evanston (1961)

[17] C. Rovelli, Ashtekar Formulation of General Relativity and Loop Space Non-Perturbative Quantum Gravity, University of Pittsburgh preprint (1991)

[18] S. Carlip, (2+1)-Dimensional Chern-Simons Gravity as a Dirac Square Root, UC Davis preprint, UCD-91-16 (1991)